

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Response and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 1-26 were examined, and all claims were rejected. Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, no claims have been canceled, claims 1-5, 14-18, 21, and 23 have been amended, and claim 27 has been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-27 are pending for examination. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **Interview Summary**

A telephone interview was conducted on January 10, 2007 between Examiner Beatriz Prieto, Examiner Benjamin Ailes, and Applicants' representative, Mr. Rob Kalinsky (Reg. No. 50,471). Also attending the meeting was Ms. Julie Skoge (an attorney with Applicants' Attorney's firm). Applicants' claim 1 was discussed in view of the cited reference. The Examiners indicated that the Applicants' proposed amendments to claim 1 appeared to overcome the prior art, but that additional consideration was needed. Accordingly, no final agreement was reached.

Applicants have amended the claims above in response to the Examiners' comments during the Interview.

For example, the Examiners requested clarification of the terms "component" and "rendering." For clarity, the term "rendering" has been amended to "processing." Support for this change can be found, e.g., in paragraphs [0043], [0045], and [0047].

Applicants also have amended claim 1 to clarify the server creates a renderable page object rather than actually rendering the page object. Applicants do not intend to disclaim subject matter pertaining to rendering the page object on the server. Rather, Applicants intend to clarify that claim 1 requires only that the page object be renderable (e.g., by the client).

The term component is used throughout the specification as a generic term indicating objects forming a page object. See, e.g., paragraph [0031] and Fig. 3 of the present application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9 and 14-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Schloss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844), hereinafter “Schloss.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, inserting any output data retrieved from an output cache and any created objects as components into a hierarchical tree data model at a server computing system; processing the components of the hierarchical tree data model at the server computing system to create a renderable page object; and sending the renderable page object from the server computing system to the client computing system.

Schloss fails to disclose or suggest sending a renderable page object as recited in claim 1 from a server computing system to a client computing system. Instead, Schloss discloses sending a page object to a client computing system after **extracting** uncacheable (e.g., dynamic) fragments from the page object at a server computing system. *See, e.g., Schloss*, column 2, lines 43-48; column 4, lines 50-55; and column 5, lines 7-9.

For example, compare the page objects shown in Figures 3 and 4 of Schloss. Figure 3 illustrates a page object having three segments labeled 330<sub>1</sub>, 330<sub>2</sub>, and 330<sub>3</sub>, respectively. Segment 330<sub>1</sub> and segment 330<sub>3</sub> are extracted to form a revised page object as shown in Figure 4. *See, e.g., Schloss*, column 5, lines 53-65; column 7, lines 11-14; and Figure 8 at module 845. The revised page object, without fragments 330<sub>1</sub> and 330<sub>3</sub>, is sent from a server computing system to a client computing system. After receiving the revised page object, the client computing system separately requests the contents indicated by the extracted fragments. *See, e.g., Schloss*, column 5, lines 7-9.

This process can be seen in Figure 6 of Schloss. Figure 6 illustrates the logic process of the server computing system. The server computing system first determines at module 610 whether a given input from a client computing system is a request for an object (i.e., a page object). If the input is a request for an object, then an object request handler is called at module 615. The object request handler parses the requested object, extracts fragments from the object, and sends the revised object to the client computing system. *See, e.g., Schloss*, Figure 7 and accompanying text.

Alternatively, if the input is not a request for an object, then the server computing system determines whether the input is a request for a fragment. A fragment handler is

called at module 620 only if the input is a request for a fragment. The server computing system does not retrieve a cached fragment or create a fragment, or even determine whether the fragment is cached or needs to be created, until the fragment handler is called. *See, e.g., Schloss*, Figure 11 and accompanying text.

For at least these reasons, Schloss does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are thus allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-9.

Claim 14 recites, in part, inserting the retrieved output data and the created objects as components into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system; processing the components of the hierarchical tree data model to create a renderable page at the first computing system; and sending the created renderable page from the first computing system to the second computing system.

Schloss does not disclose or suggest sending from a first computing system to a second computing system a renderable page including created objects and output data. Rather, Schloss discloses sending a page object to a client computing system after **extracting** fragments from the page object at a server computing system. For at least these reasons, Schloss does not anticipate or suggest claim 14.

Claims 15-22 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 14 and are thus allowable for the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 14-22.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10, 11, 13, 23, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss in view of Mattson (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,992), hereinafter "Mattson." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10, 11, and 13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Mattson does not overcome the shortcomings of Schloss. Mattson fails to disclose or suggest sending contents of the rendered page from a server computing system to a client computing system as recited in

claim 1. Rather, Mattson is directed to dynamically allocating space in a partitionable cache from a real time reference trace. *See Mattson*, col. 2, lines 42-44.

Claims 23, 24, and 26 depend from claim 14 and are allowable over Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Mattson does not overcome the shortcomings of Schloss. Mattson fails to disclose or suggest sending from a first computing system to a second computing system contents of a rendered page including created objects and pre-rendered output data that have been inserted into a hierarchal tree data model.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, and 26.

Claims 12 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,600), hereinafter "Smith." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Smith does not overcome the shortcomings of Schloss. Smith fails to disclose or suggest sending contents of the rendered page from a server computing system to a client computing system as recited in claim 1. Rather, Smith is directed to determining a desirable directory/data block ratio is a cache memory. *See Smith*, Abstract.

Claim 25 depends from claim 14 and is allowable over Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Smith does not disclose or suggest sending from a first computing system to a second computing system contents of a rendered page including created objects and pre-rendered output data that have been inserted into a hierarchal tree data model.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 12 and 25.

#### **New Claims**

Claim 27 has been newly added. Support for claim 27 can be found, e.g., throughout the specification and figures.

Claim 27 recites, in part, retrieving any static components of a web page contained in an output cache; creating at a server computing system any static components not contained in an output cache; and creating at the server computing system any dynamic components of the web page. The static and dynamic components are assembled, content is generated by processing each component, and the content is sent to the client computing system.

None of the cited references discloses or suggests sending to a client computing system content generated by processing static and dynamic components of a web page, including static components retrieved from an output cache. Rather, Schloss discloses sending dynamic components separate from the static web page. See e.g., *Schloss*, column 5, lines 7-9.

For at least these reasons, claim 27 is allowable over the cited references. Consideration and allowance of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

This Response fully responds to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2006. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Response because they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument has merit, or that the Applicants acquiesce to the argument. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and thus prompt allowance is respectfully solicited. Since the remarks above are believed to distinguish over the applied reference, any remaining arguments supporting the claim rejections are not acquiesced to because they are not addressed herein.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: February 1, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/

Name: Robert A. Kalinsky

Reg. No.: 50,471

RAK/JKS:bog:pll